PERSUASION

published by
PERSUASION, INC.
260 west 86 street, n.y.c.

35¢

JOAN KENNEDY TAYLOR, EDITOR

distributed by the
Metropolitan Young Republican Club

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I-3

Volume I, No. 3 October 13, 1964

VIEWS

THE NEW RACISM

We abhor racism wherever it may appear. And we see it in the ranks of so-called liberals, as well as in the ranks of so-called conservatives.

Let there be no mistake about it--not only would we not wish Barry Goldwater to win the Presidency on the grounds of "vote white; vote Goldwater," but we are for him in part because we are convinced that he will be outspoken against such support: that he does not want to win that way either.

For we are not anxious to see the "right" of tyranny transferred from the federal government to the government of the states. We wish to see government on all levels more concerned with the protection of the legal rights of all individuals--the rights to life, to liberty, to property, to equal representation before the law.

© Metropolitan Young Republican Club 1964

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol I #3

There are prejudices and cowardices in our society. There are cruel men and bigots. We may hate what such people stand for--we do hate what they stand for. But as long as their cruelty and bigotry is expressed on a social level, or on a level of their right to control their own private property, our recourse is to retaliate in kind--to ostracize and boycott them. Just as they have no right to bring government power to bear to aid their dubious case, so we have no right to bring government power to bear to aid our righteous cause. Much as we personally may despise them, until they exert force against others, they are within their rights.

We hold this view because of the principle of limited government assumed in the writing of the Constitution, a principle which is often under attack, although not directly. We usually consider that "limited government" means a limitation over what powers a government may have over its citizens. We submit that this can also be described as what aspects of a man's being the government may touch. We submit that, viewed in this way, the answer is obvious--government is and should be severely limited to the strictly political side of man's life--and that there are aspects of his life which can never be, on principle, of political concern. And two of these are the color of his skin and his beliefs.

Which means--his right to vote and the protection of his life, liberty and property are not conditional upon whether he is white or black or yellow; whether he is an Episcopalian, an atheist, a Mormon, or a Jew. Or a bigot.

Which means--no law can properly single him out in any way as being a Negro, or an atheist, or a Jew, or an Episcopalian. Or a bigot. As far as the law is concerned, these distinctions simply do not exist, for the fictional man with whom the government deals has no race, no religion, no national origin, and no thoughts.

Which also means--to the extent to which the government now controls facilities in education, in housing, in public parks and beaches, it is improper for the government (representing as it does all the citizens) to take official cognizance of whether or not a person dealing with these facilities is or is not a Negro, or a Jew, or an atheist, or an Episcopalian. Or a bigot.

It follows that the laws which are and have been on the books in Southern States, segregating schools and public facilities on the basis of race, are morally incompatible and legally inconsistent with the principles upon which our country was founded. The South has no grounds on which to evoke "state's rights" to defend these laws, for no state can have a "right" to violate the rights of its citizens.

It also follows that the Civil Rights Bill just enacted by Congress is in this respect equally incompatible and inconsistent with these principles. For it requires among other things that employers keep records accessible to the government of the race of its employees. The government has no right to this information; it

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has no right to require others to have this information; information on race and religion should never be a matter of law or compulsion.

There is no overall legal definition of a Negro. Southern states, which have unjust laws on their books concerning Negroes, are driven to define what it is that they are talking about. The definition is usually in terms of number of Negro ancestors, or percentage of Negro blood--but just what percentage constitutes a legal Negro varies from state to state.

How then is a law requiring the work force in any place of business with over 100 employees to be "integrated" to be implemented? How does the employer (and the government) know which employees are "Negro"? By the way the employee looks? By what he chooses to call himself? By legal affidavits from people who know his family and background? Suppose a specific individual has some Negro blood, but for reasons of his own he wishes to be treated as white. Has he a right to choose not to mention his Negro ancestor? Has his employer a right to ferret out his employee's secret in order to keep his records accurate?

We hold that the truly terrible thing about the Civil Rights Bill is that it is fundamentally racist. It certainly does also subject employers and property owners to improper regulations, violates their property rights and makes the pursuit of many businesses more burdensome and more difficult. But this is not new in American legislation. The Anti-Trust Laws, the regulatory agencies such as the Federal Trade Commission, and local discriminatory taxes such as New York City's Gross Business Tax cause more fundamental curtailment of the rights of the businessman as such.

What is new and dangerous about the Civil Rights Bill is that in the name of justice it commits a fundamental injustice--it makes race politically and economically important, as a matter of law.

Those of us who are truly concerned with the social injustice inherent in the fact that the life of any Negro is harder than the life of a white person of equivalent ability, education, and background, feel that our Constitution gave us a right to expect more from our government. We hold that we had a right to expect that the government, at least, would remain color-blind.

--Joan Kennedy Taylor

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I-3

R E V I E W S

THE GOLDWATER GIRLS

The Girls in 509, by Howard M. Teichmann, Samuel French, New York.

What is a political party platform?

By definition, it is a statement of meaningful principles and policies relating to issues which a party deems significant.
By connotation, it is a collection of insincere promises and platitudes relating to issues which a party deems expedient.

How did political platforms fall into such disrepute? Perhaps the most significant event in this connection - very likely the turning-point in platform appraisal - was Franklin Delano Roosevelt's policy statements in his 1932 campaign. After the election, the American voters saw not merely a failure to keep platform promises, but a total reversal, in principle, of what FDR allegedly advocated. The 1932 Democratic platform appeared honest and forth-right when it stated, "We believe that a party platform is a covenant with the people to be faithfully kept by the party when intrusted with power, and that the people are entitled to know in plain words the terms of the contract to which they are asked to subscribe."

A main point of this particular "plainly worded covenant" read, "We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance, to accomplish a saving of not less than 25% in the cost of federal government..."

While Roosevelt avidly campaigned in line with this platform, constantly rebuking his opponent, Hoover, for his record of deficit spending, federal interference, unnecessary bureaucracy and big government in general, the instant he crossed the White House threshold, he set into motion federal programs that snowballed into an avalanche so huge that it dwarfed any nightmare the American voter could have envisioned, when he thought of Big Government and voted against it.

Perhaps FDR's "success" at ignoring his platform set an example for future candidates; the platforms of both parties gradually deteriorated into indistinguishable collections of trite, empty phrases and it has become the rule, rather than the exception, that when a President takes office, his promises are thoroughly dispensable.

This attitude toward platforms, and specifically toward Roosevelt's campaign, is one of the main themes of a political satire which is especially timely this year, The Girls in 509 by Howard M. Teichmann. It was first produced on Octo-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I-3

ber 15, 1958 at the Belasco Theatre in New York.

"The girls," Aunt Hettie and Mimsy, are a truly unique phenomenon - a pair of ladies from an old and rich family - devoted Republican holdouts for limited government who, on the night of a Democrat's election in 1932, withdrew into the total seclusion of a hotel suite, adamantly refusing to emerge for even an instant until "That Man" got out of the White House. During the Eisenhower administration, when the hotel is torn down around them, they are discovered, and their twenty-five year retreat draws the attention of many people - assorted writers, eager newspaper reporters, and a militantly sexless social worker named Miss Freud.

When these people first descend upon them, the girls have reason to claim that they are poor. They are watching the last of their original 1932 fortune disappear, and Mimsy reluctantly suggests that they raise some money by pawning a silver-framed picture of President McKinley. Aunt Hettie, in characteristic loyal defiance, cries, "I will not part with the President who vetoed the personal income tax law!"

It is soon discovered, however, that Aunt Hettie and Mimsy are in much better financial shape than they knew. It seems that Daddy loved to invest in enticing new-fangled gadgets and left them with what the girls called "worthless patent rights" to cellophane, nylon, and air-conditioning. This new-found source of wealth attracts a new horde of opportunists, including the chairmen of both the Republican and Democratic parties.

Intentionally played by the same actor, the chairman is a comically stylized character, who epitomizes the publicly accepted image of the unprincipled politician and he eloquently demonstrates the meaningless campaign speech when he recites, "Allow me to congratulate you on your glorious discovery of the glorious Democratic Party in this glorious city of New York in the glorious month of April...Artificially divided by party symbols, in truth we stand together, shoulder to shoulder, back to back, with our eye on the ball, hand in hand, tooth and nail, one country, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all..."

Much of Mr. Teichmann's comedy revolves around the girls' "naive" attitude toward the truthfulness of a party's platform, and their utter lack of knowledge concerning "modern day politics", in general. The girls are totally unaware that there is a Republican in the White House, at last. Their only source of information had broken down long ago. As Mimsy explains, "We used to be able to lean out this window and watch the news bulletins go around the Times Building, but in 1940 they put up a billboard. What does it mean, 'Peps-oye-Cola?'"

Later, in a conversation with Mr. Allen, the Republican Party chairman, Aunt Hettie asks some innocent, legitimate questions, and is answered in an all too familiar style:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Aunt Hettie - Where do we stand on taxes?
Allen - Oh. Well. That's fine. Taxes? We're against them.
Hettie - Splendid; . . . And now that we're in Washington we've eliminated them?
Allen - What was that again?
Hettie - Taxes. The Republican Administration has eliminated them?
Allen - Well - not all of them. . . . Which ones would you like to hear about?
Hettie - The Income Tax. Is that gone?
Allen - What else would you like to hear about?
Hettie - It's not gone, then?
Allen - Well - uh . . . these are unusual times.
Hettie - What about the gasoline tax?
Allen - And such times call for increased sacrifices.
Hettie - The inheritance tax?
Allen - We must re-affirm our beliefs.
Hettie - Any of the Federal excise taxes?
Allen - We must pledge anew our loyalties.
Hettie - At least you've repealed the goddamn Social Security tax?
Allen - We must see to it . . . that our over-all superiority and leadership is maintained.
Hettie - Leadership in what? Taxes?

The two party chairmen vainly attempt to "educate" the girls by pointing out other essential political absolutes such as, "Come, come, who remembers a platform?" and, "Promises and batting averages are made to be broken."

At the end of the play, the girls' principles are unearthed, and some of Aunt Hettie's parting words are, "Well, since one political party is composed of liberal conservatives and the other of conservative liberals, my niece and I are going to endow a few universities and chairs of political science. The voters should be able to tell one party from the other."

Barry Goldwater in early 1964 brought this fictional idea to life, when he successfully gained the Republican nomination with the slogan: "A choice, not an echo."

Is there a choice between the party platforms, too? This year's Republican Party Platform opens with these words: "Humanity is tormented once again by an age-old issue - is man to live in dignity and freedom under God or be enslaved - are men in Government to serve, or are they to master, their fellow men? It befalls us now to resolve this issue anew - perhaps this time for centuries to come. . . . Even in this constitutional Republic . . . individual freedom retreats under the mounting assault of expanding centralized power."

This opening theme is re-stated throughout the document: the important focus of the platform is on individual rights. Of course, the Republicans have not totally

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I - 3

abandoned party promises of the pork barrel variety, but the emphasis on individual responsibility is clearly there.

Since the Democrats announced their policies well after the Republicans, it is fair to regard their statement as an answer to the GOP. The Democratic Party Platform greets us with this: "America is one nation, one people. The welfare, progress, security and survival of each of us reside in the common good - the sharing of responsibilities as well as benefits by all our people. Democracy in America rests on the confidence that people can be trusted with freedom."

Notice that the question raised by the Republican Platform - individual freedom or centralization - is totally ignored. Many things about this statement can be questioned, but the most questionable phrase is, "that people can be trusted with freedom."

To trust someone with something means that there is someone who owns a value and is willing to allow someone else to use or possess it under certain conditions.

The value in question is freedom. The someone to share in it is every individual -- you. Who can be the someone who owns it? Lyndon Baines Johnson? The state? And if the state owns it, who sets the conditions of the trust?

The act of linking trust with freedom, the idea of anyone in <u>control</u> of freedom, contradicts the concept of the inherent rights of man to his life, liberty and property. It means life by permission - not by right.

To simply say that there is a marked difference between the two political party platforms is an understatement. The difference is a crucial one. It is the choice between the trend toward total slavery -or- the trend toward total freedom.

Aunt Hettie - This is your year!

--Lois Roberts

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I-3

P E R S U A S I O N

IT MAKES SENSE

Why is it that the press has such seeming difficulty in understanding Senator Goldwater? To many of us who do not really consider this to be evidence of a gigantic conspiracy, it still seems unusual that so many columnists and editorial writers had such trouble with the famous "extremism" section of Goldwater's acceptance speech, for instance. It seemed crystal-clear to us, when we heard him say it, that he was pointing out that the word "extremism" has no specific moral content -- or, as a letter-writer to the New York Herald Tribune had it: "To be extremely good is good; to be extremely bad is bad."

Yet article after article (and politician after politician) wondered aloud, "What could he have meant?" The same sort of question has been raised about the issue of "violence in the streets" -- is Goldwater contradicting his own adherence to the concept of decentralization by suggesting that federal troops should police our streets?

It is obvious that he means no such thing. We suspect that, like "extremism," "violence" has been snipped out of context by reporters who wish to worry over it. (It is apparently a new and heady experience for many reporters to be able to expect a candidate to mean something by what he says -- no one asks President Johnson where "forward" is.)

There is a connection between hoodlumism and the kind of example presented by those who hold high office, as Senator Goldwater has stated. And, we submit, there is a strong connection between the actions of citizens and the official government philosophy, too.

Suppose there is inequality, hardship, and injustice in the lives of a certain section of our citizenry. And suppose that, all their lives, they have learned from political speeches, and been taught in government schools, that good housing, good jobs, good education, and all the materials of a good life come only from the government.

How would we expect individuals who believed this to react when they saw available to themselves only bad housing, bad jobs, and bad education? They have been taught that this is not a situation which individuals can change by any productive action; it is a government responsibility.

Obviously, if it were true that only the government could improve the lot of any citizen, he would be a helpless pawn if his government allowed his lot to remain miserable. He could not work, he could not move, he could not educate himself -- he could only riot in the streets.

It is the logical outcome of welfarism.

* * * * * *

NEW DEAL, FAIR DEAL, AND NOW, BIG DEAL

In August, the New York Times reported that the police of New Hanover

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I-3

Island in New Guinea were having a great deal of trouble finding room in jail for all the followers of a new cult who are refusing to pay their taxes.

The so-called cultists have decided that, whether the United States does or not, they want President Johnson for their king. When they were not allowed to write in his name during their first general election last February, they stopped paying their taxes in order to save up enough money to buy him.

What we'd like to know is, who has offered to sell him? We thought Bobby Baker had retired.

* * * * * * *

WILL SOMEONE PLEASE DECIDE?

What's "reasonable" discrimination because of race, religion, sex or national origin?

The Federal Civil Rights Law now makes it illegal to discriminate on these grounds except where it is "reasonable" to do so, and this is what the courts will have to decide.

The New York Times on September 13 reported that the National Association of Manufacturers has been running a series of seminars to help employers comply with the law.

Some questions raised by the article are--is it reasonable for a woman to demand employment as a barber? Can a man hire a pretty girl as his secretary, or will he be required to accept the application of a better-qualified man?

Is it "reasonable" to require an employer to hire a woman, if this means he will have to provide four times as many washroom facilities, as required by state law?

Take the following hypothetical want ads:

Stevedores wanted -- male.

Nursery school teacher wanted -- female.

Salesman--sell structural steel.

Language teacher -- must be native of country whose language he or she teaches.

High fashion model -- 5'9" or over. (This effectively excludes Oriental girls.)

Which of these ads would be found to be reasonable, and which not?

And what about the company that refuses to hire a homosexual because he might be a security risk? Is this discrimination on the basis of sex?

The courts will be given a very unpleasant job, to say the least.

* * * * * * *

HERE WE GO ROUND THE GOVERNMENT BUSH

In protesting the suggestion that the Brooklyn Navy Yard be closed (presumably as an unnecessary expense), Senator Kenneth Keating (Republican, N. Y.) pointed out on Wednesday, Octo-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I-3

ber 7 that the government had already contracted to build ships in both Norway and Portugal.

If anyone wonders why we oppose the minimum wage laws, let him contemplate for a moment the spectacle of a government which on the one hand supports the concept of a minimum wage, and then on the other hand economizes by building ships in foreign countries where labor costs are not so high.

Thus they can attempt to please labor leaders (by keeping domestic labor costs high) and also those who seek government economy (by actually employing lower-cost foreign labor).

Can the government make this novel economic system satisfy everyone? Tune in on November 3 -- or, better yet, vote.

* * * * * * *

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED